DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 307 SO 026 907

AUTHOR Stomfay-Stitz, Aline M.
TITLE Education, Psychology, and Social Science: Common Pathways for Teaching Peace.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (New York, NY, August 12, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict Resolution; Critical Thinking; Decision Making; Elementary Secondary Education; Global Education; Human Relations; *Peace; Problem Solving; *Prosocial Behavior; *Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the contributions of several disciplines of the social sciences to peace education and peace psychology and focuses on positive gains in several aspects of peace education and conflict resolution witnessed by the researcher in over 10 years of work. The paper contains the following sections: (1) Introduction; (2) "Definitions and Historic Perspectives on Peace Education"; (3) "Contributions from Psychology"; (4) "Contributions from Anthropology"; (5) "Contributions from Political Science"; (6) "Contributions from Sociology and Social Work"; and (7) "Peace Education in Action--The Voices of Teachers, Children, and Young People." The paper maintains that a multidisciplinary approach to peace education should be the common goal for the new century. Contains 65 references. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 407 307

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Aline M. Stomfay-Stitz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Education, Psychology,and Social Science: Common Pathways for Teaching Peace

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

S0026907

Aline M. Stomfay-Stitz, Ed.D.
Associate Professor of Education
Christopher Newport Univ.
Newport News, VA 23606

Paper prepared for presentation at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, August 12, 1995.

Introduction:

Ten years ago, I began my research in peace education, first as a classroom teacher concerned with endless conflicts and antisocial behavior, and then later as a college professor preparing future teachers for America's classrooms. As a result of these dual arenas, I was now determined to assist my students with the same classroom problems that I had once faced. This led me to create a new, more inclusive perspective on the education of the younger generation. With humility, I no longer believed that those in education alone were capable of the reforms that were needed. I became further convinced that it was through the contributions of peace education that we had the power to create a more peaceful, alternative education for America's young. Truly, I can now view peace education and peace psychology in a similar manner. After years of research down similar pathways in social science, a common viewpoint should be shared by many of us, because we have emerged with similar goals.

Today, I'd like to first highlight a few contributions from the past, ones that have been valuable ones from several disciplines in social science; and second, to focus on positive gains in several aspects of peace education and conflict resolution. These offer signs of hope for all of us.

In search of a metaphor that could link us together in a common mission, the optical illusion came to mind. First, one views distinct, separate lines, then discovers, through that sensory experience, that these lines appear to merge at a single meeting point in the distance or on the horizon. In a similar vein, we share common guideposts to peace education and peace psychology. We may have expertise within our own discipline, yet, the message I'd like to emphasize today, is that together all in social science have the potential to accomplish even more. We have the power to move closer to a unified goal, reduced violence in our communities and schools, and a more peaceful society for all of our children.

As I read the brief abstracts of the various presentations planned, I was excited that each one of us was involved in a curriculum, program, project, or an ongoing process that together could make a deep impression on children or young people, in all areas: intellectual, physical, social, and emotional. As we listen, I believe we will be able to discern our common bonds.

Today, I'd like to highlight a few contributions from colleagues in social science and then, focus on several signs of progress in peace education and conflict resolution.

Definitions and historic perspectives on peace education:

In a spirit of humility, I wish to be the first to admit that this area we will examine - peace education or teaching for peace - is exceedingly difficult, very holistic, often tenuous - certainly not an area where any one person can honestly claim to have the whole picture. Many peace educators, as myself have adopted a definition of peace education that includes a concern for teaching nonviolence, conflict resolution, economic well-being,(translated as basic needs for survival), political participation,(education for citizenship) and concern for the environment.

As always, our peace education pioneer, Betty Reardon, has summed up peace education as multi-dimensional with links to multicultural and global education, religion and ethics, human rights,- all within a pedagogy of peace that is utopian and visionary. Peace education, she concluded has "greater potential as a starting point for a . . . comprehensive approach to education for global transformation." (Reardon, 1988; 1994).

In my research into the historic roots of peace education in America, I learned that teaching for peace changed considerably over the course of the past century (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, 1994, October). Colleagues who wrote about teaching for peace in the late 1890s, in the shadow of the new century, believed that education for peace could enlighten a new generation of youth in the moral

and economic abominations of war. The Darwinian theories of evolution, natural selection, and survival of the fittest were rationalized. Writers emphasized that war had been an inheritance of our race by mere habit, as a survival of the most militant tribues. Civilization, therefore, should evolve naturally into a humane society where all could live in harmony (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993).

The new century was viewed as a time when American society would witness "the steady progress of the race toward humanity . . . (as) a member of the family of nations." (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). Writers on peace, at that time, often emphasized that militarism was a step backward for society, equated with barbarism, a mark of the Dark Ages while the new century was symbolized by progress and civilization. Peace was viewed as the keystone of intellectual freedom and essential for the education of civilized men and women. A new method of limiting violence was tried - arbitration - which was introduced at the Hague Peace Conference in 1895, one hundred years ago. The ideals of a world at peace for all humanity appeared to be a distinct possibility. Of course, we can emphathize with those dreamers of the past century. Their dreams, have become ours as well, a painful inheritance and reminder that our common pathways still beckon us to move forward in a quest to secure a more peaceful world.

A noted anthropologist and peace researcher viewed peace education as a social learning process, with the development of skills that include sensitivity toward one's own and others' feelings and attitudes. Educators for peace, therefore must work on two levels: (1) the macrolevel, with a focus on dismantling the structures of violence; and (2) at the microlevel, promoting appropriate actions to change attitudes, from violent to more peaceful ones. Such a design is admittedly utopian, but is also pragmatic, based on human needs, attitudes, and feelings (Wulf, 1993-94). In a similar vein, Zimbardo and Leippe have enriched our knowledge of attitude systems influenced by outside agents.

For example, when we teach rules of behavior to children, these can be internalized and function as personal guides , exerting "a powerful influence on our behavior and self-conceptions" (Zimbardo & Leippe, 1991).Peace education, therefore, could be viewed on the one hand, as a curriculum or course of study, while on the other hand, considered as a process to transform an individual, and hopefully, to advance human rights and equality for all humankind. These are goals we share in common with others in social science.

Contributions from psychology:

A brief glance into the past to consider a few contributions from psychology, anthropology, political science, sociology and social work, and education - underscores that a potential for success does exist. The few examples that I wish to cite are but a few of hundreds that could be included. We have had many distinguished and enlightened contributions from various branches of psychology. From our historic roots, Morton Deutsch has already honored William James, the first peace psychologist,(Deutsch, 1995), whose Moral Equivalent of War in 1880 appeared often in the writings and libraries of the early peace societies. His was a voice raised especially at the turn of the century, a voice for hope and optimism for the new generation.

Oher psychologists have also added to peace educators' views on the image of the enemy, on the effects of the nuclear age on children and youth, on the "psychic numbing" that may still be a factor in the emotional lives of many. Others have enriched our knowledge of the political socialization of children to war, such as the work of Howard Tolley, Jr.(1973), Dan Christie and Linden Nelson (1988)on attitudes toward nuclear war, Others such as James Garbarino and Kathleen Kostelny(1991), in recent years, have documented the impact of violence on young victims, and especially the trauma of violence in the inner city. Emily Werner and Ruth Smith(1992) have enriched our knowledge of the

resiliency of children who can overcome, even the trauma of violence, if positive conditions for child rearing are present.

One of the earliest scholars engaged in psychological isssues related to war and peace, with influences on peace education was Ross Stagner from the University of Akron. In 1939, he wrote of the need to "build tolerance in our children from the earliest years of life." He recognized that understanding would need to be taught in a peace education curriculum from "kindergarten . . . through the high schools and colleges" with "an integrated series of experiences planned. . . to establish in the minds of young people the idea of peaceful methods of solving national conflicts." (Stagner, 1939). For over 50 years, peace educators have viewed this as mutual common goal.

Later, other psychologists, such as, Robert Havighurst and Mark May, carried forward these ideas. Both wrote in the shadow of World War II. Havighurst recognized the tragedy of peace education being "lumped together with subversive activities," while Mark May proposed that training for parents in constructive, peaceable attitudes was needed for the socialization of the child, as a humane, caring member of society (Havighurst, 1943; May, 1943).

Of primary importance, is the pioneering work of Morton Deutsch (1949, 1973, 1991) and David and Roger Johnson (1979, 1989, 1991, 1995), among others, research that centered around the cooperative, rather than competitive relationships with the classroom as a social milieu for the constructive, positive elements that can foster learning and conflict resolution.

Since that time, other psychologists, such as Herbert Kelman and Lee Hamiliton have enriched our roles as peace educators in others ways. Their research has included the roles and parameters of dissent and dissenters, which are issues that face all, at some point, who wish to become proactive for peace education (Kelman & Hamilton, 1989). Here, they have discerned that dissent is

an "obligation of loyal citizens", yet dissent, as witnessed by the current debates that still hone in on the Vietnam conflict, confirms that acts of disloyalty and charges of unpatriotism are still a problem area.

Papers from previous conventions of the American Psychological Association have helped to define the field of peace education. For example, as a result of research undertaken by Dan Christie on the changes of attitudes and fear reduction as a result of using the nuclear war curriculum titled "Choices," Christie advocated a closer collaboration between peace educators and psychologists (Christie, 1991). Furthermore, Michael Wessels has added an extra dimension with his proposals for peace education unfolded within a culture of peace, as a pedagogy and a process of active involvement of school, family and community (Wessels, 1994).

Conditions in our schools and communities have deteriorated to a critical point, as recently articulated by Noguera(1995) and Singer (1994). As a result, the common bonds of peace education and peace psychology should become interwoven with the work of others in social science.

Contributions from anthropology:

Anthropologists have also contributed a vision of societies where children can change their behaviors from aggressive to nonaggressive, offering convincing proof that cultures exist where cooperation and nonviolence play a central role in human relationships (Lasley, 1985, 1994). The research of Douglas Fry also concluded that "an integration of ecological. . . and psychocultural factors, including social learning processes. . . provides a more satisfactory account of conflict behavior than any single approach alone. . . as contributors to violence or peace." (Fry, 1992). From the perspective of anthopology, Lasley especially has created an image of "selflessness" described as an "extra-centeredness" where the child learns compassion and caring (Lasley, 1994). In sum, anthropologists

have contributed images of groups who have reared young in nonviolent circles of love and caring. Yet, the myth persists that humanity harbors genetic predispositions toward violence, with preordained outcomes for war and agression deeply implanted in behavior and human events.

These are important factors, because we face a society immersed in violence, one where violence is a commodity that occupies leisure hours, entertainment, and media for vast numbers of children and young people. In several areas, voices of concern have been raised by organizations in psychology, education, family and child welfare, and public health(APA, 1993; Garbarino, 1994; National Center for Clinical Infant Programs, 1992, NAEYC, 1990, 1993; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 1993; and Rosenberg, 1991). These represent others from public health and social welfare who should be invited to join us in our common mission - safer communities, families and schools for the younger generation.

Clearly, the contributions of those working in social science, as articulated by Federico Major sounded a call for action. Writing in our Peace Psychology journal, he offered a foundation for a multidisciplinary framework that complements a peace education curriculum (Major, 1995).

Contributions from political science:

We can next turn our attention to contributions from political science. These offer common guideles and concepts are included often in a peace education curriculum. For example, studies on the political socialization of young children have been a focus of interest, especially, their early understanding of authority figures, their national and community identities, and attitudes toward peace and war (Allen, Freeman & Osborne, 1989). The research of Judith Torney-Purta in the area of political socialization, emphasized that concern for social issues also included the peer group, with the construction of knowledge

often taking place "in a social context of age mates, both in the classroom and outside", generally from the age of ten through young adulthood(Torney-Purta,1995).

This research on the importance of the social context can also be applied to the dynamics of attitude change and shaping of problem solving that takes place during the conflict resolution and peer mediation process (Stomfay-Stitz, 1992, 1994). Middle schoolers, for example, sum up their various viewpoints of the conflict, brainstorm for possible solutions, with the social setting, the interplay of language exchanges, reshaping a final scenario. In some cases, there is an open act of reconciliation or forgiveness. We witness tears, a hug, a sense of saving face so that all can proceed with their lives.

Contributions from sociology and social work:

From sociology, we have research that placed young people involved in peace and social justice activism under the lens of discernment. As a result, the researcher, Doug McAdam underscored that lifelong consequences accrue when young people assumed roles as activists in the causes of peace education and social justice. A study was made of the decisions of young people involved in Freedom Summer(1964). Here, groups of college students from the North joined black students in Mississippi in a series of educational ventures, known as Freedom Schools. Study of the curriculum revealed that the group dynamics of a social justice workshop, the respect for the dignity of the human person which was taught as a core value, could meet criteria for a peace education curriculum. Subsequently, McAdam, sociologist at the University of Arizona, studied 212 participants in Freedom Summer, which he identified as "high-risk activism." As a result, he demonstrated a "strong effect of participation on the subsequent lives of the volunteers". On the whole, they remained "more politically active throughout the sixties . . and remain so today."(McAdam, 1989). He showed that decades

later, they are involved as adults in occupations described as the "helping professions" as social workers, teachers, counselors, religious leaders, or medical personnel - still concerned with efforts to aid fellow humans. Their experiences as youth involved in service to humanity, in the cause of peace and social justice, made deep and lasting impressions (McAdam, 1986, 1988, 1992). In a similar vein, those working in peace education, have found that it is equally important to involve our students in real world events. Since the seventies, peace educators have documented the impact of teach-ins, boycotts, student marches and personal activism, on the lives of young involved in peace and social justice.

As I searched for appropriate models for the integration of peace education and peace psychology, it was the accomplishment of social service-social work activists that drew my attention. The community school concept is one of recent vintage, an idea that advocates that our public schools should become full-service community centers, open year round, with on-site health, dental, and counseling services, child care, parent/adult education, cultural events and summer camps. Here, the usual school curriculum as we traditionally know it, is expanded into an integrated one with learning an on-going feature, before and after school, open to all in the community, in a spirit of full inclusion. In a community school all would be welcomed- parents, children and other residents. This is no longer a utopian dream, but actually in operation here in New York City, a project of the National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration at Fordham University. For instance, the Children's Aid Society joined in partnership with the New York City Board of Education and Community School District 6. The middle school involved is IS 218 and has been a part of the program since 1992, joined also by an elementary school, PS 5 in 1993. Both are in Washington Heights, located on the Bronx-Manhattan border, an area of low-income families with many recent immigrants from the Dominican Republic. Both schools are full service

"community schools." (National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration, 1995). This model would be an ideal source for the integration of principles of peaceful, nonviolent child-rearing practices . I can envision the work of peace educators and peace psychologists working with various groups of children, teens or adults. This underscores also, that with a multidisciplinary perspective - drawing all of our separate pathways to the one meeting point on the horizon - a fuller awareness of the potential success of peace education and peace psychology could follow.

Peace education in action - The voices of teachers, children and young people:

Peace education has often been identified as an area that should ideally begin with our children, our youngest children. As an early childhood educator, I have been especially aware that the critical ages of children are between two and ten. These are the years when the early influences of caregiving, nurturance, and schooling have the potential to affect their attitudes toward life and especially their relationships with others.

A peace education curriculum for young children would ideally center around several factors: (1) fostering cooperation, including problem solving and skills to resolve conflicts; (b) respect for self and others; (c) appreciation of cultural diversity; and (d) the role of pervasive, cultural violence, including television, electronic games, moves, and dramatic play portrayals that are stimulated by toys and action figures, such as Power Rangers (Hinitz, 1994); Stomfay-Stitz & Hinitz, 1995, April).

The environment or setting for the child - the peaceable classroom -is a basic element that fosters synergy in a peace education curriculum. The teacher, for example, may be the key element as the role model and enhancer of prosocial behavior and peaceful attitudes (Stomfay-Stitz, 1992; 1994). Others,

especially teachers in Montessori programs, have already incorporated the philosophy of their founder, Maria Montessori, a blueprint for an ideal prepared environment for learning and especially for learning the principles of peaceful attitudes and behavior (Montessori, 1932; American Montessori Society, 1993, 1994).

In a Position Paper on Peace Education, schools were urged to make peace education "a planned, intentional part of a school's curriculum" with teachers as "models of peace, respect, and unconditional love and acceptance for all people."(American Montessori Society, 1994). While primarily private programs, Montessori-based kindergartens have been incorporated into public schools in several urban communities, often as a magnet school program to foster desegregation.

As has been noted, major additions from psychological theory have formed a framework for an early childhood peace education curriculum. The contributions of social learning theorists have been noteworthy. The work of Albert Bandura(1973) and Bandura and Walters(1963) , the principles of observational learning, have been joined with a broad base of theory in child development. Piaget, Dewey, Vygostsky, Erikson, among others, have formed the building blocks. Piaget, for example, believed that cooperation and mutual respect are connecting links needed to create a "sense of justice" for children in a group setting. In a recent interpretation of Vygotsky's theory, Davydov believed that specific functions are not given to a child at birth but are only provided as cultural and social patterns, ones that take place in the process of "teaching and upbringing." Furthermore, it is the social interaction, "the collective activity of the child and adult, and among children themselves" that would result in genuine assistance and growth (Davydov, 1995). Children, therefore, who should be included in a peace education curriculum, and especially, with an introduction to

conflict resolution and problem solving skills - are essential actors and agents in their own learning and behavior, in response to social situations. These contributions from psychology are vital ones.

Consequently, the most hopeful thoughts and ideas I would like to share with you today, come from the teachers, children and young people I work with, have talked with, or read about in this past year. I'd like to share these.

First, my own work has been shaped by a long-standing goal. Working with my colleague from Trenton State College, Dr. Blythe Hinitz, who has also written extensively on peace education, we have attempted to develop an awareness for the integration of peace education into early childhood education(Stomfay-Stitz & Hinitz, 1995a). My colleague is meeting in Yokohama, Japan this month with an international early childhood education organization on this topic. We plan a publication and several brochures and leaflets from various early childhood organizations. Our hopes have been strengthened by the fact that peace education has recently been identified by leading researchers as an "alternative curriculum" (Spodek, B., 1993; Spodek & Brown, 1993). Of course, our ultimate goal, is the integration of peace education into teacher education programs, where there is a vital need for enlightenment. .These are all hopeful steps forward.

As teachers, we are always alert to brave, first steps taken in peace education by our colleagues in peace education. One of our favorite examples is in Springfield, Ohio, where Shirley Wuchter has spearheaded a summer full-week program, known as "Peace School." Here peacemaking skills are taught to youth and adults in a cooperative learning environment (Wuchter, 1994). In Ridgewood, New Jersey, Travis Jackson and fellow teachers started a program known as Cultural Alladay, a peace education program with building blocks for cultural diversity and appreciation for the heritage of others. These events included

dedication of Peace Poles at several schools(Cultural Alladay, 1995). Finally, between 1990 and 1993, 208 schools in Ohio began programs in conflict resolution, with documented positive gains.(Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution & Conflict Management, 1993-1994). All of these highlight the role of courageous teachers, administrators, staff, and students, who are learning to work together in peaceful ways. Numerous examples, lists of resources and curriculum materials can be found in Ian Harris' book Peace Education(1988) and in the Resource Directory for Peace Education in America, 1828-1990: Sourcebook for Education and Research (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993).

The voices of the younger generation need to be heard. The first group of young people I met in April included a very impressive group of teenagers. There were from several ethnic groups, the conflict resolution/peer mediation team at Mission High School in San Francisco. Along with their faculty sponsor, they graciously met with members from the Peace Education Special Interest Group, during a conference of the American Educational Resarch Association. They commented on their experiences as problem solvers in their peer mediation program. The setting was the Haight-Asbury district where we could see drug deals in progress across the street from the school. We met in a classroom room decorated with Peace Dove posters and the flags of 18 countries representing the birthplaces of the students - One young man shared with us that his training with conflict resolution and peer mediation aided him to assist his classmates with serious, often violent problems. But even better, he found that this training in peaceful human relations skills had a tangible, positive effect on his part-time job. He told us: ":I can help even angry customers. I'm a better listener . . . It gives me a good feeling to help people." This is a frequent comment we hear from peer mediators. Perhaps, this is the secret to providing positive feedback to even our most aggressive, least lovable young people.The Community Board of San

Francisco is the present day group that offers conflict resolution and problem solving training in their public schools. We learned from these students that the intercultural conflicts in the schools often result in violence and racial tension. They perceive that learning to solve problems has reduced violence and made for a more peaceful school. Sadly, though, classroom teachers have no training.

An additional personal experience includes my own work with a volunteer tutoring program for our university students that I started last year, matching them with an inmate at the Juvenile Detention Center in Newport News. Here, detainees as young as 12 are imprisoned awaiting trial for the commission of felonies and acts of violence. They are primarily minority youth. As we tutor the inmates in English, biology, mathematics, history or geography, we meet them on a personal basis, as fellow humans. Our students serve as positive role models, but beyond that, they learn valuable lessons in resolving personal conflicts and ways to counter prejudice and racial bias . One of my students, crafted a word-processed "magazine" for their poetry and writings, which is a popular pastime for the inmates. Here is a personal "message to young people" written by a young woman of sixteen:

> Being in lockup has made me realize that drugs do nothing but screw up your life. Look at me now . . . I've lost my freedom . . . most of all being able to see my Mom every day and tell her that I LOVE HER! So think about it when you take someone's life. In reality, you're taking your own life.

In sharp contrast, on a more positive note, the voice of a young man involved in a peacemaking project, offers a strong case for the positive nurturance of peacemaking in young lives. On August 4th, a peace memorial was dedicated in the desert of Los Alamos, the result of several years of a Children's Peace Statue campaign in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The project inspired children in

community schools to launch a memorial similar to the one for Sadako in Hiroshima. She is the real-life heroine of the story by Eleanor Coerr, Sadako and the Thousand Paper Cranes. Noe Martinez, of Mexican parentage is a secondary student and won the award for the design of the peace memorial, which will be in the form of a Peace Garden ("America's Children," 1994). He described his contribution to the children's peacemaking project:

> The fountain is the focal point of the oasis . . . surrounded by . . . flowers that form the shape of the continents . . . Children can . . . bring seeds of . . . plants and flowers from their various homelands . . . and plant these seeds in the grassy fields . . . As time passes by the seeds will grow into plants . . . and the children will grow into adults as well. Then, they too will bring their sons and daughters to this . . . oasis . . . as proof that peace has come. (Martinez, 1994).

These are but a few of the many examples of children who are involved in peace education projects. In addition, there are perhaps many more who are allied with conflict resolution programs, where they learn to solve problems of violence in their own lives.

As trained professionals with the power to influence young lives for peace, we all need to close ranks and discern on a personal level, what each and every one of us can contribute to bringing peace into young lives. Psychology, sociology, social work, anthropology, political science, and education can be a formidible force for peace. As a beginning, perhaps, the Peace Psychology Division could contribute a small corner of their new journal to a Sharing Peace column - where news and resources or a call for assistance from colleagues, could be a concrete example of our united efforts and willingness to help others.

My colleague in peace education, Ian Harris from the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, is the author of the handout that reports on ten years of peace education in Milwaukee Schools. He has written that we need to "use . . .

professional skills to contribute to the dialogue to create a safer world . . doing something about the violent threats that dominate modern life. . . to build a consensus of peace (Harris, 1988; 1995).

In the past few years, there has been a gradual convergence of peace education and themes of care and caring, as areas of emphasis for the reformed American school curriculum - ones that incorporate the intellectual as well as affective areas(Noddings, 1993). Nel Noddings, especially, has written extensively on themes of caring and articulated this goal as being at the "core of human existence." She believes that a curriculum could be arranged around

> themes of care-caring for self, for intimate others, for strangers and global others, for the natural world and its nonhuman creatures, for the human-made world and for ideas. (Noddings, 1993).

She further stated that "a fundamental change(is) required . . one of attitude."(Noddings, 1995).

As these lines of congruence for the themes of care and caring appear to merge with strands of peace education, it is tempting to appear hopeful that fundamental changes may be possible in American schools. In recent years, for example, a heightened awareness of the potential of peace education, has become more commonplace, at least, as judged by inclusion in leading educational publications. It is especially the acceptance of one aspect, conflict resolution, that offers signs of hope (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993b).

Many courageous peace psychologists and educators, joined with others in social science, have already demonstrated that their lives can bring a change in the attitudes of children, youth, and their parents. I believe that together, we can create the new, caring, more humane person, who can face the new century with courage.

In conclusion, my mission was to share with you a positive view, namely, that a multidiscipinary approach to peace education should be our common goal for the new century. This is in the spirit of those colleagues in social science whose places we are taking - those who wrote and worked fervently in 1895 to bring to fruition their dreams for a world of peace. We are the new century's first messengers. United, we can be a powerful force for peaceful change.

References

Allen, J., Freeman, P. & Osborne, S. (1989, January). Children's political knowledge and attitudes. Young Children, 44(2), 57-61.

American Montessori Society(1994, Spring). American Montessori Society Position Paper on peace education. Montessori LIFE, 6(1), 7.

_____(1993, Spring). A plan for peace education (including Th Mission Statement). Montessori LIFE, 5(1), 36.

American Psychological Association (1993). Violence and youth: Psychology's response, Vol. 1: Summary Report of the APA Commission on Violence and Youth. Washington, DC: APA.

"America's children plan a peace monument"(1994, November 6). Parade Magazine.

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H. (1963). Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Christie,D.J. (1991). The measurement of psychological constructs in peace education. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Boston, August 10-14, 1991.

_____ & Nelson, L. (1988, July/August). Student reactions to nuclear education. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 44, 22-23.

Cultural Alladay (1994). Diversity Newsletter, Spring 1994. Peace Pole Dedication. Ridgewood, NJ: Ridgewood Public Schools.

Davydov, V.V. (1995, April). The influence of L.S. Vygotsky on education, theory, research, and practice. Transl. S.T. Kerr. Educational Researcher, 24(3), 12-21.

Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of cooperation and competition. Human Relations 2, 129-152.

_____. (1973). The resolution of conflict. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

_____. (1991). Educating beyond hate. Peace, Environment, and

Education, 2 (4), 3-19.

____. (1995). William James, the first peace psychologist. Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 1(1), 27-36,

Fry, D.P. (1992, September). "Respect for the rights of others is peace": Learning aggression versus nonaggression among the Zapotec. American Anthopologist, 94, 621-639.

Garbarino, J. (1994, Summer). Protective responsibility as an antidote to a socially toxic environment. Wingspread Journal, 16(2), 1, 10.

——. & Kostelny, K. (1991). No place to be a child: Growing up in a war zone. New York: Lexington Books.

Harris, I.M. (1988). Peace education. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.

_____(1995, April). Teachers' response to conflict in selected Milwaukee schools: A report submitted to the Department of Psychological Services, Milwaukee Public Schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Havighurst, R.J. (1944). The education problem. In G.B. deHuszar, ed. New perspectives in peace. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 162.

Hinitz, B.F. (1994). Early childhood education for peace. In Child care and early education: Resources for early childhood. H. Nuba, ed. New York: Garland Publishing.

Johnson, D,.W. & Johnson, R.T. (1979). Circles of learning. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

_____. (1989). Cooperation and competition: Theory and research. Edina, MN: Interaction Book.

_____. (1991). Teaching students to be peacemakers. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co.

_____.(1995, February). Why violence prevention programs don't work --and what does. Educational Leadership, 63-67.

Kelman, H.C. & Hamilton, V.L. (1989). Crimes of obedience: Toward a social psychology of authority and responsibility. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lasley, T.J., II. (1985, Autumn). Fostering nonaggression in the classroom: An anthropological perspective. Theory into Practice , 24, 247-255.

_____. (1994). Teaching peace: Toward cultural selflessness. Westport, CT: Bergin Garvey.

Major, F. (1995). How psychology can contribute to a culture of peace. Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 1(1), 11-16.

Martinez, N. (1994, July). The Crane: Children's Peace Statue Newsletter, 3(1), 1.

May, M. (1943). A psychology of war and peace. New Haven: Yale University Press.

McAdam, D. (1986). Recruitment to high-risk activism: The case for Freedom Summer. American Journal of Sociology, 92, 64-90.

_____(1988). Freedom Summer. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____.(1989, October). The biographical consequences of activism. American Sociological Review, 54, 744-760.

_____. (1992, March). Gender as a mediator of the activist experience: The case of Freedom Summer. American Journal of Sociology, 1211-1240.

Montessori, M. (1972). Education and Peace. Chicago: Henry Regnery.

National Association for the Education of Young Children.(1993,September). NAEYC Position Statement on violence in the lives of children. Young Children, 45(5), 18-21.

_____. (1990, July). NAEYC position statement on media violence in children's lives. Young Children, 45(5), 18-21.

National Center for Clinical Infant Programs.(1992). Call for violence prevention and intervention on behalf of very young children. Arlington, VA: Zero To Three/National Center for Clinical Infant Programs and the Violence Study Group.

National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (1993). The prevention of youth violence: A framework for community action. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration (1995, June). What is a "Community School?": Children's Aid Society offers answers. Conversations: Supporting Children and Families in the Public Schools, II. (4). 1. New York: National Center for Social Work and Education Collaboration/Fordham University.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring, a feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

_____. (1993). The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education. New York: Teachers College Press.

____. (1995, May). Teaching themes of care. Phi Dela Kappan, 76(9), 675-679.

Noguera, P.A. (1995, Summer). Preventing and producing violence: A critical analysis of responses to school violence. Harvard Educational Review, 65(2), 189-212.

Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution & Conflict Management (1995). Working together for winning solutions: Annual report 1993, 1994. Columbus, OH: OCDRCM.

Reardon, B. (1988). Comprehensive peace education: Educating for global responsibility: Teacher-designed curricula for peace education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

_____ & Norland, E.,eds. (1994). Learning peace: The promise of ecological and cooperative education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Rosenberg, Marc L. ed. (1991). Violence in America: A public health approach. New York; Oxford University Press.

Singer, M. I. (1994, November). The mental health consequences of adolescents' exposure to violence. Final report, Center for Practice Innovations, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University.

Stagner, R. (1939, May). Some psychological foundations of peace education. Secondary Education, 8, 138-142.

Stomfay-Stitz, A. M. (1992). Teaching young children nonviolence and conflict resolution skills: Research and classroom activities. In Multicultural education for the twenty-first century. Morristown, NJ: Silver Burdett Ginn.

_____(1993). Peace education, 1828-1990: Sourcebook for education and research. Metuchen, NJ: and London; Scarecrow Press.

_____.(1993b) Heightened awareness of peace education. Peace, Environment and Education, 4(1), 28-38.

_____. (1994, October). Peace education for children: Historical perspectives. Peace, Environment and Education (International Peace Research Association), 4(1), 28-38.

_____(1994). Conflict resolution and peer mediation: Pathways to safer schools. Childhood Education,70(5), 279-282. Included also in Annual Editions: Education, 1995-96. Guilford, CT: Brown & Benchmark.

_____ & Hinitz, B.(1995, April). Integration of peace education in early childhood education programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Tolley, H., Jr. (1973). Children and war: Political socialization to international conflict. New York: Teachers College Press.

Torney-Purta, J. (1995, Winter). Psychological theory as a basis for research. Perspectives on Political Science: Symposium Issue., 24(1), 23-33,

Werner, R. & Smith, R. (1992). Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Wessels, M.G. (1994, October). The role of peace education in a culture of peace: A social-psychological analysis. Peace, Environment, and Education, 4(1), 39-54.

Wulf, C. (1993-1994). Relationship of peace to education: Some solutions/strategies. International Journal of Humanities and Peace, 16(1), 66-67.

Wuchter, S.D. (1994, December). Peace school: A community-focused cooperative learning model. Lutheran World Federation Educator.

Zimbardo, P. & Leippe, M. (1991). The psychology of attitude change and social influence. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. Foreword, xv, Preface, xvii-xviii.